

# Exhibit 1

1  
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
3 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

4 - - - - -x

5 BENJAMIN ASHMORE,

6 Plaintiff,

7 -against-

11 Civ 8611  
(JMF)

8 CGI GROUP, INC. AND CGI FEDERAL  
9 INC.,

10 Defendants.  
11

12 - - - - -x

13 DEPOSITION of TONY GORRIS, taken by  
14 Defendants, pursuant to Notice, held at the  
15 offices of Kaiser, Saurborn & Mair, P.C., 111  
16 Broadway, New York, New York, on Thursday, June  
17 13, 2013, commencing at 10:25 a.m., before  
18 Margaret M. Harris, a Shorthand (Stenotype)  
19 Reporter and Notary Public within and for the  
20 State of New York.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

KAISER, SAURBORN & MAIR, P.C.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
111 Broadway  
New York, New York 10006

BY: DAVID N. MAIR, ESQ.

BOND SCHOENECK & KING  
Attorneys for Defendants  
111 Washington Avenue  
Albany, New York 12210-2211

BY: STUART KLEIN, ESQ.

P R E S E N T:

Marybeth Carragher

Jacquenette M. Holmes, Esq.

Benjamin Ashmore

1  
2 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND  
3 AGREED that the filing and sealing of  
4 the within deposition be, and the same  
5 are hereby waived;

6 IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND  
7 AGREED that all objections, except as  
8 to the form of the question, be and  
9 the same are hereby reserved to the  
10 time of the trial;

11 IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND  
12 AGREED that the within deposition may  
13 be sworn to before any Notary Public  
14 with the same force and effect as if  
15 sworn to before a Judge of this Court;

16 IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED that  
17 the transcript is to be certified by  
18 the reporter.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2 T O N Y G O R R I S, called as a witness,  
3 having been first duly sworn/affirmed by  
4 Margaret M. Harris, a Notary Public within  
5 and for the State of New York, was examined  
6 and testified as follows:

7 EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. MAIR:

9 Q Good morning, Mr. Gorris. My  
10 name is David Mair. I am going to be  
11 questioning you today in a deposition.

12 If at any point during the  
13 deposition you don't understand the question or  
14 you don't hear the question, then let me know  
15 and I'll rephrase it or repeat it, as  
16 appropriate.

17 A Okay.

18 Q Another couple of ground rules.  
19 Just if you can answer all questions verbally  
20 instead of by a nod or a gesture, that will help  
21 the court reporter take it down.

22 In addition, if you can wait for  
23 the question to be fully completed before  
24 answering, again, that will make sure that we  
25 get an accurate record today. I will try to do

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

the same for you with your answers.

A Okay.

Q Can you state your full name for  
the record?

A Tony Gorris.

Q And where do you currently  
reside?

A Lakewood, Ohio.

Q And where do you currently work?

A CGI Federal.

Q And which office?

A The Cleveland office.

Q Can you run through for me your  
educational background?

A Starting with college?

Q Starting with college, yes.

A I did my undergrad work at the  
University of Dayton. I got a bachelor's in  
political science.

And then I got a joint law degree  
and master's in public administration at  
Cleveland State University.

I graduated from Dayton in '92  
and Cleveland State in '96.

1 Gorris

2 Q Was your joint master's and law  
3 degree done full time or part time?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Were you working at the same time  
6 as you were taking that degree?

7 A Part time.

8 Q Part time where?

9 A A variety of odd jobs.

10 I don't know -- do you want me to  
11 go into those?

12 Q You can tell me by category, if  
13 you want to tell me by category.

14 A The first two years it was just  
15 cleaning jobs. I did some painting jobs.

16 And then later on I worked for  
17 about a year for Cleveland State with their  
18 master's program. They had a grad assistant  
19 that I received.

20 And then following that I worked  
21 for some attorneys in Fairview Park, Ohio,  
22 Hildebrandt, Williams & Farrell.

23 Q And, I'm sorry, what year did you  
24 say you got your bachelor's?

25 A I got my bachelor's in '92.

1 Gorris

2 Q Between '92 and starting your law  
3 degree at Cleveland State, did you work  
4 anywhere?

5 A It was a four-year program.

6 Q So you went straight from one to  
7 the other?

8 A Correct.

9 I had a summer job of labor for a  
10 waterproofing company.

11 Q What was your first job after  
12 Cleveland State after you graduated?

13 A I continued working for  
14 Hildebrandt, Williams & Farrell for  
15 approximately two years.

16 Q Did you take the bar exam?

17 A I did.

18 Q And did you pass it?

19 A Yes. I was admitted to the bar  
20 in October of '96.

21 Q To the Ohio bar?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Are you admitted in any other  
24 states currently?

25 Let me rephrase that.



Gorris

Have you been admitted in any other states?

A No.

Q Are you still a member of the Ohio bar?

A My license is inactive.

Q So you, after graduating from law school, you worked at the Hildebrandt law firm for two years, you said?

A Approximately, yes.

Q What type of work did you do there?

A Research. They focus -- research, writing briefs. I'm trying to remember, it's been a while.

They were a family law practice in the suburbs. So just a lot of general different types of things, small criminal cases, domestic cases.

Q So it's fair to say the area of law in which you worked was primarily family law with some criminal law?

A Yes.

DUI types or small-level cases,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

misdemeanors.

Q After Hildebrandt, where did you work?

A I worked for a company called Shaker Square Area Development.

Q What type of business was that?

A It was nonprofit development corporation.

Q And why did you leave Hildebrandt?

A I didn't find the work interesting.

Q So to get into other areas of law?

A Yes -- it wasn't -- I was -- when I was -- I was not planning on practicing my entire career.

Q When you went to work at Shaker Square, what did you do there?

A I worked -- we did -- we worked with a commercial district, I worked with that. They received community development block grant funds from the City of Cleveland.

So we helped the commercial

Gorris

district market themselves and to do beautification programs and to get grant monies.

We also had a couple of development projects, commercial and residential, some that were in the process of being developed, bought by our company to be developed. They had gone into disrepair and others that we currently owned that we were managing, so property management was an aspect of it, as well.

And then from time to time I would do some legal work for them, some evictions, things of that nature.

Some property tax, if there were issues with property taxes, things like that.

Q So your position was a combination of legal and nonlegal work?

A Correct.

I would say it was about 90 percent nonlegal.

Q What was your role on the development, property development and property management side?

A It would, for the development, it

1 Gorris

2 was usually after purchase, working to get the  
3 units rented.

4 And the one I was most directly  
5 involved with was an apartment building, working  
6 to get the units renovated, because it was in  
7 such a state of disrepair, and finding  
8 contractors. And, yeah, just getting it  
9 rehabilitated and ready for management.

10 Q How long did you work at Shaker  
11 Square?

12 A I would say approximately two  
13 years, two to three years, two to three years.

14 Q And that was approximately '98 to  
15 2001; is that correct?

16 A I stated with CGI in July of  
17 2000. So it would have been, it was more than  
18 two years, but less than three, because I  
19 remember I went through two pay cycles.

20 Q Do you remember when you left  
21 Hildebrandt?

22 A No. Approximately -- no.

23 Q Did you have a title at Shaker  
24 Square?

25 A I cannot remember it.

Gorris

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Q So in July of 2000 you began work  
at CGI?

A Yes.

Q Why did you leave Shaker Square?

A Looking for more growth  
opportunity. It was a small corporation.

Q And you went to work immediately  
at CGI after that?

A Yes.

Q What was your first position at  
CGI?

A It was in a quality assurance  
role.

Q Do you remember the title?

A Quality assurance specialist, I  
believe.

Q How long did you have that  
position?

A Four to five months.

Q Who did you report to?

A Kind of a blend, because it was a  
startup between Marybeth and George Pilla, if I  
remember correctly.

Q Were you based out of the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

Cleveland office?

A Yes.

Q Have you always worked out of the  
Cleveland office?

A No. No. One year out of our  
Oakland office.

Q What year was that?

MR. KLEIN: You can answer  
the question.

Go ahead.

A That would have been 2004 to  
2005.

MR. KLEIN: David, so  
there is no confusion, I just  
want to make sure that -- I don't  
know if CGI, I don't think he has  
changed employers, so to speak,  
but I think there's some mergers  
and acquisitions that we talked  
about yesterday, so Tony may be  
confused.

I just want the record to  
be as clear as possible.

Q When you say you went to work at

Gorris

CGI in July of 2000, was the entity that you worked for then called CGI?

A No, it was not.

Q What was it called?

A It was called IMR Global.

Q Was IMR Global acquired by CGI at some point?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall when that was?

A I don't recall the exact date.

Q And did your employment with the company overall continue after the acquisition of IMR by CGI?

A Yes.

Q It continued uninterrupted?

A Yes.

Q And throughout your time working for IMR and/or CGI, you have always worked in the Cleveland office with the exception of the one year that you told us you worked in Oakland?

A Correct.

Q Can you just describe generally your job duties in the quality assurance role?

A At that time we had just, I was

1 Gorris

2 hired right after they won the Ohio contract and  
3 it was, the job responsibility at that point in  
4 time was to set up the QA responsibilities and  
5 the QA roles and then transitioned into actually  
6 doing the quality assurance.

7 Q You were saying the QA roles?

8 A Yes, I'm sorry. QA as in quality  
9 assurance.

10 Q And this was on the Ohio PBCA  
11 project?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And CGI or, I guess, IMR at that  
14 point had just won Ohio PBCA work; is that  
15 correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And you said you were in the QA  
18 position for six or seven months?

19 A Correct.

20 Q What was your next position?

21 A Regional manager.

22 Q For what region?

23 A It initially was Lucas region and  
24 Stark.

25 Q S-T-A-R-K?



1 Gorris

2 A Yes.

3 Q Stark region?

4 A Yes.

5 Q What are the Lucas and Stark  
6 regions?

7 A The Ohio contract at that time  
8 was divided into four regions, and the regions  
9 were named after the larger counties, and Lucas  
10 was the county in the Toledo area and Stark was  
11 the county in the Canton, Ohio area.

12 Q So you were regional manager for  
13 two regions of the Ohio PBCA?

14 A Correct.

15 Q How long did you have that  
16 position?

17 A I had that until approximately  
18 early 2004 -- I'm sorry 2003, early 2003.

19 So about three years.

20 And I also did the Trumbull  
21 region, as well.

22 Q Trumbull?

23 A Yes.

24 Q So if I'm doing the math right,  
25 you started at CGI or the predecessor company in

Gorris

July of 2000, you were in the QA role for six or seven months, which takes us to early 2001.

So am I correct that you were in the regional manager role for approximately two years?

A Yes, approximately two years.

Q Until early 2003?

A Yes. General dates, yes.

Q What were your job responsibilities as regional manager?

A I was responsible for dealing with our subcontractors who did our management reviews.

I was responsible for reviewing those management reviews and making sure they were compliant and run out timely.

I was responsible for working with our central staff, which was IMR, or CGI staff. They were responsible for processing vouchers, which were subsidy payments for owners, and they were also responsible for doing contract renewals and rent adjustments.

Those were the big tasks.

Q To whom did you report during

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

that period as regional manager?

A Marybeth Carragher.

Q You reported directly to her?

A Yes.

Q From that point onwards until today, have you continuously reported directly to Ms. Carragher?

A Yes.

Q And have you ever had a legal role at CGI?

A No.

Q Or at IMR?

A No.

Q You have only been on the business side?

A Yes.

Q In terms of your corporate title as regional manager, was your corporate title that of manager?

A Yes.

Q What was your next role at CGI?

A It was area manager.

Q Did you then supervise a number of regional managers?

Gorris

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A Yes.

Q Who reported directly in to you?

A Yes.

Q Did your corporate title remain  
that of manager?

A Yes.

Q During what period were you area  
manager?

A Approximately early 2003 until  
May 2004.

Q Were you the area manager for all  
of Ohio or only a portion?

A Ohio is divided into two areas,  
if you will, the Columbus area and the Cleveland  
area.

I was responsible for the  
Cleveland area.

Q And, again, your duties were  
limited to PBCA duties; is that correct?

A There was nothing substantial  
outside the PBA that I can recall.

Q PBCA?

A PBCA, yes.

Q After area manager, what was your

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

next job?

A I became the transitional team manager, if you will, for the California PBCA contract, which evolved into client rep.

Q So you began as transition team manager and than you became client representative?

A Yes.

Q Did you continue to have any responsibilities for Ohio during that time?

A Only as I transitioned out and then in -- I've since become involved in Ohio again, but in 2004 for a number of years my main PBCA focus was just California.

Q Had CGI just won the California PBCA?

A Yes.

Q And that was the transition role that you played?

A Yes.

Q In terms of client representative, can you describe what was involved in that role?

A I'm sorry. Can you repeat the

Gorris

question?

Q Yes.

In terms of being the client representative for California, what was involved in that role?

A My role with the California contract is, one, for overall management of the contract.

All of the team in California reports, except all of the operations team in California reports directly to myself, and then as far as client representative, I also deal with the client as far as making sure that our contract, the requirements of our contract are being met, that they are happy with our performance, and, of course, they are given the information from us to pass timely and to report back to their board.

Q How long did you have the client representative, area client representative role?

A I am still responsible for the California contract in all of those aspects.

Q Did your duties change at some point?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

I guess the question is, did they expand at some point for California?

(Whereupon, at 10:45 Ms. Holmes left the room.)

A For California?

During the startup, I would say during the initial four to six months, I was mostly responsible on the operations side, and Marybeth Carragher had a bigger role on the client side.

Q In 2004 you began your role as client representative for California?

A Yes.

Q What was your next position or change or expansion of position?

A In 2005, approximately 2005, honestly I don't recall the specific date, for about a year I served as the client representative, similar, if not the exact same role with the Florida PBCA.

Q What was your next position?

A I'm sorry, actually in probably, before that, some of these things blend together because the dates overlap.

Gorris

In late 2005, I served as, I guess you would call it a transitional team leader, for lack of a better term, for the New York PBCA. I was very involved with that for about two years.

Q That was when CGI won the subcontract of work for New York?

A Yes.

Q So it sounds like you've had duties that have sort of been added and subtracted over a period of time?

A Yes.

Q Can you continue the description of that until today so we get an overview?

A Sure.

So in 2005, beginning in approximately September of 2005, I added the transitional team roles for New York.

Initially I was responsible for the bringing on of the work in process and also with the identification and hiring of staff.

As that went to the, the contract went live, my focus became more on the team that was doing the management reviews, and I worked



Gorris

directly with that team, just getting them up to speed on the compliance requirements and getting the managers comfortable with what their roles were and how to use our systems and just understanding all the different compliance requirements that are part of that.

During that period I also, probably in about early 2006 I became involved with the Florida PBCA for about a year working directly with the state manager and the client. It was a role similar to California, although I would say I was much less involved with Florida than I was with California. It wasn't a startup.

Q Did you continue having involvement with California and New York when you also had involvement with Florida?

A Yes.

Q So what was the next change in your role?

A For New York I was involved for about two years. So I would -- I don't know if you need the end date, I don't know that I would remember the end date.

1 Gorris

2 For Florida, I was involved with  
3 that for about a year.

4 And then I would say the next,  
5 sometime during that period my role changed  
6 from, to director of consulting services, and we  
7 began to look at what was coming up with the  
8 recompute.

9 I don't recall the date of when  
10 we actually started looking at that hard, but  
11 that was an area where I became more involved in  
12 October of -- and this wasn't that long ago,  
13 2012, I became -- no, I'm sorry, October 2011, I  
14 took over responsibility for client management  
15 and operations for the Ohio and D.C. PCBA  
16 operations.

17 (Whereupon, at 10:50 a.m.,  
18 Ms. Holmes enters the room.)

19 Q You took that over from Tracey  
20 Rudy?

21 A Yes.

22 Q When she left the company?

23 A Yes.

24 Q When did you become director of  
25 consulting services?

1 Gorris

2 A I believe it was 2006.

3 Q And when you became director, did  
4 your duties change in terms of your client  
5 relationship management duties with various  
6 state PBCA work?

7 A No.

8 Q So it was a change in title?

9 A Yes. My duties had changed.  
10 It was the title catching up to  
11 the duties, I believe.

12 Q Up until 2006, your corporate  
13 title was that of manager?

14 A No. Actually, in 2005 for about  
15 a year I had the, a year to a year and a half, I  
16 guess, I had the title of executive consultant.

17 Q And that was a higher title than  
18 manager; is that correct?

19 A Yes. It's my understanding, yes.

20 Q If you are not sure, then you can  
21 tell me.

22 I guess my question is, was it a  
23 higher title or a title --

24 A It was considered a higher title.

25 Q -- that was a similar level in

Gorris

the hierarchy?

A I'm sorry?

Q Was it higher or a similar level of the hierarchy or lower?

A It was considered in our group a higher title.

Q Your group being?

A The practice that reported through Marybeth Carragher, and I guess at that time George Pilla.

Q So the BPS group?

A Yes.

Q When you became an executive consultant, was there a salary increase as a result of that?

A Yes.

Q So you held that for about two years prior to becoming director?

A Approximately, yes.

Q Now, in terms of the states that you have had responsibility for from 2006 onwards, can you just list for me the states that you have had responsibility for during some or all of that time?

1 Gorris

2 A Sure.

3 For our PBCA operations, I had  
4 responsibility for, responsibility, I'm sorry,  
5 can I ask you a clarifying question?

6 Q Sure.

7 A When you say "responsibility  
8 for," do you mean the entire operations  
9 responsibilities or any involvement in?

10 Q Let's start off with entire  
11 operations responsibility?

12 A Okay.

13 I have had entire operations  
14 responsibility in the past or currently for  
15 California, Florida, D.C., the District of  
16 Columbia and Ohio.

17 Q During what period did you have  
18 that for California?

19 A I would say approximately October  
20 2004 through, and I still have that  
21 responsibility.

22 Q Florida?

23 A I had it for about a year. I  
24 don't recall the exact dates. Around 2006,  
25 2007.

1 Gorris

2 Q And when did you have  
3 responsibility for D.C.?

4 A That began in approximately  
5 October 2011.

6 Q And it continues?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And Ohio?

9 A That began approximately October  
10 2011 and that continues.

11 Q Have you, during the time that  
12 you have been director, have you had any  
13 responsibilities outside of the PBCA work?

14 A Yes.

15 Q What responsibilities?

16 A I've had responsibilities --  
17 well, most recently I'm involved with the State  
18 of New York, with their Sandy recovery project.  
19 I am working with their group that is doing the  
20 call center.

21 Q Have you had responsibility for  
22 other non-PBCA consulting work?

23 A That would be an example of it,  
24 the Sandy recovery.

25 Also I have had responsibilities

Gorris

for short projects that we did with the Chicago Housing Authority.

I have had business development responsibilities, and I know, but can't recall the exact requirements of the work that I have had other responsibilities, as well, both, I know definitely within CGI where I participated in teams just that have looked at ways to do things better within CGI.

Q Have you headed the pursuit of any work other than the ones you have listed, beyond the PBCA?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

Q So other than the Chicago Housing Authority and the Sandy recovery project, have you been the person leading a pursuit for other work, whether you won it or didn't win it?

A I have never led a formal pursuit at CGI.

Q Have you been on teams that have been involved in pursuits?

A Yes, I have.

Q And who have those teams been led

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

by?

A I have been involved with the PBCA pursuit and that team was led by Marybeth Carragher.

I do not recall outside of PBCA any additional ones that I have been involved with.

Q And the PBCA, you are talking about the rebid by HUD?

A Both the rebid and looking at ways to grow our business prior to that.

Q For example, by winning New York?

A I wasn't involved in New York, but we had at times looked and spoken with other jurisdictions to see if they were interested in our services, such as Southern California.

Q And these were discussions with public housing authorities to see whether they may be interested in having CGI replace the current subcontractor that they were working with?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

Q Is that correct?



1 Gorris

2 A In some cases, yes, they were  
3 sometimes state agencies, they were sometimes  
4 doing that work themselves.

5 They didn't necessarily have  
6 subcontractors.

7 Q During the New York transition,  
8 did you have any direct involvement with anyone  
9 at HUD?

10 A Yes, but limited.

11 Q Who did you deal with at HUD?

12 A I was -- I was never the main  
13 contact with HUD.

14 I would be on e-mails or would  
15 have to forward things from time to time.

16 I quite honestly don't recall the  
17 names.

18 Q What was the reason that you were  
19 working out of the Oakland office for a year?

20 A We had won the contract in May of  
21 2004. We had no staff out there. We had no  
22 office.

23 I was offered the opportunity to  
24 live out there, so they had a presence out  
25 there.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

Q Did you do anything to prepare for today's deposition?

A Other than meet with the attorneys prior.

Q So without telling me what was said in the meeting, how many times did you meet or speak with the attorneys for the purposes of preparing for today's deposition?

A Twice, I believe.

Q Once this morning?

A Yes.

Q For about an hour?

A I don't know the time; half hour maybe.

And once approximately five days ago.

Q Was that in person or by phone?

A The one today in person, the previous one by phone.

Q How long did the previous phone call last?

A Twenty minutes maybe.

Q Have you reviewed any documents in preparation for today's deposition?

1 Gorris

2 A No.

3 Q Have you in the last six months  
4 reviewed any documents relating to the HUD rebid  
5 process?

6 A Only -- well, the rebid process  
7 is ongoing, so I am continuing looking at  
8 documents related to the rebid process.

9 Q So let me change the question  
10 then.

11 Have you looked at any documents  
12 from 2010 relating to the rebid process in the  
13 last six months?

14 A The only time I recall looking at  
15 documents related to the rebid process was when  
16 I was pulling them in a request for information.

17 Q From the attorneys for this case?

18 A Yes.

19 Q What information did you pull for  
20 the attorneys?

21 A I pulled all documents that were  
22 requested.

23 I believe that they were related  
24 all to our -- well, any documents related to the  
25 rebid I believe was what was requested.

1 Gorris

2 So that would have been  
3 everything that I had related.

4 Q When you gathered that to give to  
5 the attorneys, did you read the substance of any  
6 of those documents?

7 A No.

8 Q Were you asked to gather any  
9 communications that you had had with Mr. Ashmore  
10 as part of that process?

11 MR. KLEIN: I'm going to  
12 object to the extent that it asks  
13 for, it infers that you're asking  
14 for communication between  
15 counsel.

16 MR. MAIR: I'll change it.

17 Q Did you search for any  
18 communications between yourself and Mr. Ashmore  
19 in order to give them to the attorneys?

20 A I cannot recall how I conducted  
21 the search.

22 I know I went through all my  
23 files from those years.

24 I am sure that if I had any  
25 direct e-mails to Mr. Ashmore that I sent them.

Gorris

Q Let's talk a little bit about the HUD rebid process.

A Okay.

Q The PBCA work that's awarded by HUD can only be awarded to a public housing authority; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And over the years CGI has sought to enter into partnerships with public housing authorities as a subcontractor doing some or all of the PBCA work for that location, correct?

A Yes.

Q And at the time HUD announced that it was going to rebid the PBCA work, CGI was a subcontractor for a number of states, correct?

A Yes.

Q And at that point in time CGI was a subcontractor for a total of something in the region of 270,000 units; is that correct?

A That's a close approximation, yes.

Q 267,000; is that correct?

A I don't know. I would -- that's

1 Gorris

2 very close to what my knowledge is.

3 Q And when HUD announced that it  
4 was going to rebid the PBCA work, CGI saw this  
5 as an opportunity to try to increase the number  
6 of units that it was subcontractor for, correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And the initial approximate  
9 number of units that CGI was targeting was  
10 somewhere in the region of 900,000; is that  
11 correct?

12 A I don't recall.

13 Q You mentioned earlier you were  
14 part of a team at CGI headed by Ms. Carragher,  
15 whose responsibility it was to handle the rebid  
16 process of the PBCA, correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And was that group internally  
19 referred to as the rat pack?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And while Mr. Ashmore worked for  
22 the company, during a period of time he was on  
23 the rat pack, correct?

24 A I -- yes. Yes.

25 Q And the rat pack essentially

Gorris

comprised Ms. Carragher and her direct reports;  
is that fair to say?

A Yes.

Q I'm going to show you what was  
marked yesterday as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, which  
is an organizational chart.

If you take a look at Ms.  
Carragher's group in that organization, leaving  
aside Diane Wright, is it fair to say that all  
of those people listed were part of the rat  
pack?

A (Perusing document.) Yes.

Q And Michael McManus was also part  
of the rat pack?

A Yes.

Q And throughout the rebid process  
the rat pack met on occasion and had numerous  
conference calls to strategize and implement the  
rebid, correct?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
form.

A Yes.

Q And were you part of that process  
from beginning to end?

Gorris

A Yes.

Q And I understand it's ongoing, but by "end" in this case, I'm referring to the point at which the rebid proposals were put in in the initial rebidding of that ACC contract?

A Yes.

Q Now, at some point during that process HUD announced to the industry that it was considering putting in place certain restrictions on both public housing authorities and subcontractors, correct?

A Yes.

Q And one of those restrictions was a restriction on the number of units that any public housing authority or subcontractor could apply for in the rebid, correct?

A Yes.

Q It was known as the unit cap?

A Yes.

Q And initially HUD announced it as a proposal to the industry that it was considering imposing, correct?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.



1 Gorris

2 A I don't recall if -- how they  
3 made the announcement.

4 Q You don't recall whether they  
5 announced it, first of all, as a proposal and  
6 later on as a decided upon restriction; is that  
7 what you're saying?

8 A I do not recall if they first put  
9 it out as a proposal or if it was first put out  
10 as a this is how we are going to proceed.

11 Q When HUD first talked about a  
12 unit cap, the rat pack started strategizing  
13 about how to deal with a unit cap, correct?

14 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
15 form.

16 A Yes.

17 Q And is it fair to say that  
18 initially the rat pack's strategizing comprised  
19 two different elements, one was a lobbying  
20 effort to try to ensure that no unit cap was  
21 actually implemented as part of the rebid  
22 process?

23 A Can you restate the question?

24 Q Yes.

25 As part of its strategizing, did

Gorris

the rat pack come up with ways in which they could lobby HUD to try to persuade HUD not to implement the unit cap?

A That is not my recollection.

Q Tell me your recollection.

A There was the -- there was one big facet of what our strategy would be would be to not have the unit cap.

I don't recall the rat pack team, other than generally talking about it, being involved with the lobbying effort.

I believe that that was something that was not handled directly on that call, as part of that team meeting.

Q So let me see if I understand.

You're saying there was discussion amongst the rat pack about CGI's lobbying efforts, but the rat pack was not directly involved in directing those efforts?

A Not the entire rat pack.

Q A subgroup of the rat pack was?

A I don't -- I believe they were working actually with the, with individuals in Fairfax.

Gorris

Q        Regardless of who was directing the effort, it's fair to say that one strategy that CGI was implementing as part of the rebid was to try to persuade HUD not to impose a unit cap, correct?

A        Yes.

Q        And at that point in time, a final decision had not been reached by HUD on the unit cap, correct?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

A        I do not know.

There was a break between when we were aware of it and when the invitation to bid was released.

I have no idea if HUD's mind was made up or not.

Q        So sitting here today, you don't recall there being a period of time during the period that you were on the rat pack where HUD had announced that it may impose a unit cap restriction, but that it had not yet made a final decision?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the

1 Gorris

2 form.

3 Q Is that correct?

4 A No.

5 Q It's not correct?

6 A There was a period of time when  
7 HUD made the announcement of a unit cap to the  
8 time that the invitation was released, in which  
9 we looked at ways to lobby, which were handled  
10 mostly outside of the rebid team call.

11 Q During that period of time, was  
12 it your understanding that HUD had made a final  
13 decision that there was going to be a unit cap?

14 A It was my understanding that HUD  
15 had every intention to proceed down that route.

16 I have no idea how final their  
17 decision was.

18 Q Was there a discussion on some of  
19 these rat pack calls about how final the HUD  
20 decision was?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And what do you recall about  
23 those discussions?

24 A I recall that we felt there was  
25 at least enough room there to try and lobby, and

1 Gorris

2 there was also an understanding that we should  
3 be prepared for that.

4 Q An understanding that the rat  
5 pack should be prepared for the eventuality that  
6 the lobbying was unsuccessful, correct?

7 MR. KLEIN: Object to  
8 form.

9 A We should be prepared for all  
10 options.

11 Q So during the rebid process, the  
12 rat pack discussed various options that CGI  
13 could utilize in the event the unit cap stuck;  
14 is that correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And that was discussed over a  
17 number of months of rat pack phone calls and  
18 meetings, correct.

19 A I don't recall the time frame,  
20 but it was several, several calls, at least  
21 several months, I would imagine.

22 Q When you say you would imagine,  
23 are you saying that your recollection is not  
24 clear on that today?

25 A My recollection is not clear.

1 Gorris

2 Q Initially the number of units  
3 that HUD was talking about for the cap was  
4 300,000, correct?

5 A That sounds correct, yes.

6 Q And later on they increased that  
7 number to 400,000, correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And ultimately when the proposal  
10 came out, it was slightly over 400,000, correct?

11 A I believe it was a percentage,  
12 so, yes.

13 Q It was a percentage of the total  
14 units under the overall PBCA program, correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Now, at some point in time there  
17 was a discussion amongst rat pack members of the  
18 possibility of forming new corporate entities in  
19 order to get around whatever unit cap was put in  
20 place, correct?

21 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
22 form.

23 A I would not call it a discussion.

24 Q What would you call it?

25 A My recollection is that it was

Gorris

mentioned on one call in which it was very shortly after HUD announced the potential of the unit cap, that it may have -- it was probably the first call after HUD announced the unit cap, that Marybeth started off the call just by trying to get everybody refocused, because it was a surprise, and that she said that she's gotten a number of different ideas, I recall her mentioning that idea specifically, and that she said that that is not something we will be pursuing and that was where the discussion began and ended.

Q Let me see if I understand your answer correctly.

Your recollection sitting here today is that the first time the idea of setting up separate corporate entities to get around the unit cap was discussed was also the very last time that it was discussed, is that your recollection?

A Yes.

Q Is that a definitive recollection sitting here today?

A That's the only discussion I can

1 Gorris

2 remember us having.

3 Q And are you certain sitting here  
4 today that the first time that was discussed Ms.  
5 Carragher said on that occasion that it was not  
6 an option that would be discussed any further?

7 A I recall her saying that it was  
8 not something that we were looking to pursue.

9 Q And you are testifying that in  
10 the first call that it was ever discussed she  
11 said that?

12 A That's what I recall, yes.

13 Q I just want to make sure I  
14 understand what you're saying.

15 Are you telling me that you don't  
16 recall it being discussed in any other call, or  
17 are you telling me that you recall definitively  
18 that it was not discussed in any other call?

19 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
20 form.

21 A If it was ever brought up again,  
22 it was never something that was discussed or  
23 pursued with any type of energy.

24 It may have been mentioned for  
25 ten seconds or by somebody else, but it was



1 Gorris

2 never a strategy, an option or anything else.

3 Q I understand that it might not  
4 have been pursued.

5 My question is, is it your  
6 recollection that the concept may have been  
7 discussed for however short a period of time in  
8 more than one rat pack call?

9 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
10 form.

11 A I don't remember it ever being  
12 discussed on a rat pack call again.

13 Q You don't recall it being  
14 discussed, but you are not able to say  
15 definitively that it was not discussed on any  
16 other call; is that correct?

17 MR. KLEIN: I believe his  
18 answer was "I don't remember."

19 MR. MAIR: I'm asking the  
20 witness.

21 MR. KLEIN: But he has  
22 answered the question.

23 MR. MAIR: Well, then you  
24 have an objection and that's  
25 noted.

1 Gorris

2 A Can you repeat the question?

3 Q Yes.

4 Sitting here today, Mr. Gorris,  
5 can you tell me categorically that the only time  
6 the concept of potentially setting up multiple  
7 corporate entities to get around the unit cap  
8 was discussed was on only one occasion?

9 A No.

10 Q Now, when the concept of setting  
11 up multiple corporate entities to get around the  
12 unit cap was brought up, is it your recollection  
13 it was brought up by Ms. Carragher?

14 A She brought it up in that  
15 meeting.

16 I believe that she was responding  
17 to something somebody else had brought up to  
18 her.

19 We were all thinking, trying to  
20 think of ideas.

21 I may have even brought it up to  
22 her, I don't recall, but I know that we were all  
23 coming up with, trying to figure out how to get  
24 around this.

25 Q Is it fair to say that the rat

Gorris

pack was brainstorming for ideas that may or may not be used to get around the unit cap?

A Yes.

Q And as part of that brainstorming, did Leslie Pierce come up with an idea that maybe outside corporate entities could be used for the rebid and then ultimately CGI could acquire those corporate entities after the contract was awarded?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

A No.

Q Did anyone ever discuss on any phone call or in-person meeting or informal discussion at a bar or somewhere else the concept, as a proposed concept, that CGI might be able to set up corporate entities outside of CGI for the rebid and then after the contract was awarded reacquire those entities?

A Not in my presence.

Q You are stating that definitively?

A Yes.

Q So let's leave aside the part

1 Gorris

2 about reacquiring or acquiring these entities  
3 after the contract was awarded.

4 A Okay.

5 Q Tell me everything you remember  
6 about the discussions of the concept of setting  
7 up outside corporations that could be used to  
8 get around the unit cap.

9 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
10 form.

11 A The only discussion I remember  
12 was the one I previously referenced in which  
13 Marybeth brought up that the suggestion had been  
14 made to pursue this with outside companies owned  
15 by current members of CGI and that this was not  
16 something that we would pursue.

17 I believe we joked about it for a  
18 couple of minutes and then moved on to the next  
19 item on the agenda.

20 Q So in that conversation, I'm  
21 sorry, and that was a rat pack call that you  
22 recall?

23 A It was with the full team  
24 members. So, yes, it would have been a rebid  
25 call.

1 Gorris

2 Q Was that a call that Mr. Ashmore  
3 was present on?

4 A I do not know.

5 Q In that call Ms. Carragher said  
6 that a concept had been raised of some of CGI  
7 directors setting up outside companies for the  
8 rebid process, correct?

9 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
10 form.

11 A She indicated that the concept  
12 had been raised, that -- I don't recall the  
13 number of people, but where it was, where the  
14 idea was that we had a separate company set up  
15 by a director or directors, I don't recall the  
16 numbers.

17 Q And that was referring to the  
18 directors that reported in to Ms. Carragher?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Ms. Carragher also said during  
21 that call that the concept that had been  
22 proposed was that those outside companies set up  
23 by the directors at some point in the future  
24 would become part of CGI, correct?

25 MR. KLEIN: Object to the

1 Gorris

2 form.

3 A I do not recall that ever being  
4 part of that discussion --

5 Q That was -- I'm sorry?

6 A -- or any discussion.

7 Q You understood that to be the  
8 implication of what was described by Ms.  
9 Carragher as having been proposed, the  
10 implication being that after HUD awarded the  
11 contract, those outside director companies would  
12 somehow become part of CGI again, correct?

13 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
14 form.

15 A We never discussed it in that  
16 detail. So, no.

17 Q It's fair to say that from the  
18 rat pack call that you recall, Ms. Carragher  
19 referenced that there had been discussions prior  
20 to that about the idea of setting up outside  
21 companies that would be headed by CGI directors,  
22 correct?

23 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
24 form.

25 A I don't recall if it was

Gorris

discussions or somebody sent an e-mail or what.  
I don't know, I don't recall how it came to her  
attention.

Q She didn't say that in the call?

A I don't remember if she did.

Q So it's fair to say that the call  
that you remember the rat pack having was a call  
where Ms. Carragher described the concept of CGI  
directors setting up outside companies for the  
rebid to get around the unit cap and stated that  
that concept was not going to be pursued; is  
that a fair description of what you recall?

A Can you repeat that? I'm sorry.

Q Yes.

MR. MAIR: Can you read  
that back, Margaret?

(Whereupon, the record was  
read back by the reporter.)

A Yes.

Q Can you place that conversation  
as to when it occurred?

A I don't recall dates, but I know  
it was immediately, and by "immediately," I mean  
within a day, I believe, of HUD making the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

announcement on the cap.

Q That's the announcement where they stated that there would be a unit cap?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall that announcement being made in June of 2010?

A I don't recall.

MR. MAIR: Mark this as Exhibit 19. It's an e-mail from William Durivage dated June 9, 2010, together with an attachment that is headed "CAOM/PBCA Conference Call June 9, 2010."

(An e-mail from William Durivage dated June 9, 2010, together with an attachment that is headed "CAOM/PBCA Conference Call June 9, 2010," was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 19 for identification, as of this date.)

BY MR. MAIR:

Q Mr. Gorris, can you take a look at what we have marked as Exhibit 19.

MR. MAIR: While you are



1 Gorris

2 reviewing that, we will put a  
3 statement on the record.

4 As we agreed in  
5 yesterday's deposition of Mr.  
6 Kyprianou, some of the exhibits  
7 that I'm using today do not have  
8 the CGI production number or  
9 confidentiality designation on  
10 them and so we are going to treat  
11 all of the exhibits as  
12 confidential until I locate those  
13 numbers, put them on the  
14 document, we agree upon it, and  
15 we agree as to those that are not  
16 confidential.

17 MR. KLEIN: That's a fair  
18 statement and we still will rely  
19 upon the agreed-to  
20 confidentiality agreement  
21 regarding the treatment of the  
22 confidential language within the  
23 transcript of all the witnesses.

24 MR. MAIR: Yes, we'll  
25 follow the procedure in the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

confidentiality stipulation.

MR. KLEIN: Perfect.

A (Perusing document.)

Q You received this e-mail on or  
about June 9, 2010?

A I'm sure.

Q You are listed as a recipient?

A Yes.

Q You don't have any reason to  
believe you didn't receive it?

A I have no reason to believe I  
didn't.

Q Now, are you familiar with the  
CAOM/PBCA conference call that's referred to in  
that document?

A Yes.

Q It's a conference call that HUD  
had with the industry in general to announce  
updates on the PBCA rebid process; is that fair  
to say?

A Correct, yes.

Q And Debra Lear was the HUD  
official that typically handled the call?

A She moderated, yes.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

Q And if you take a look on both of the attachments, that's labeled "Minutes of the meeting," on Page 4, at the bottom of the page it refers to the fact that there is going to be a 400,000 unit cap.

Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Now, does that refresh your recollection as to when HUD announced that it was going to implement the unit cap?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

A No.

Q Initially when HUD announced that it was considering restrictions on the rebid process, HUD said that it was considering a 10 percent profit restriction; isn't that correct?

A At some point in time that was part of their discussion, yes.

I don't recall if initially, I don't recall if that was part of their initial discussions, but at some point that was.

Q And then at a further point along the process HUD announced that it had decided

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

not to implement a profit restriction, correct?

A Yes.

Q And if you take a look at the page after the page that we were looking at in the minutes of the conference call, unfortunately they are not numbered, it begins at the top "New ACC"?

A Yes.

Q In the second bullet point it states, "A lot of concerns about the profit caps/admin fees, that has been taken out."

Do you see that?

A (Perusing document.) Yes.

Q So does that refresh your recollection that it was at the point of this June 9th call that HUD announced that it was not going to pursue the profit restriction?

A (Perusing document.) Yes.

Q And does that help you place June 9, 2010, as also being the point in time that HUD announced that it was definitely going to include a unit cap?

A No.

Q You don't recall one way or the

Gorris

other?

A No, not based on what I'm reading.

Q And it doesn't help refresh your recollection?

A I'm still not certain.

Q Is it your recollection that at the time HUD announced that it had decided not to impose the profit restriction, it also announced that it was going to move ahead with the unit cap restriction?

A I don't know for certain. No, I don't know. I don't remember. I'm sorry.

Q You don't remember?

A No.

Q You've mentioned the conference call in which Marybeth Carragher said that CGI was not going to pursue the idea of setting up outside corporations that would be headed by directors.

Do you recall that testimony?

A Yes.

Q Other than that, during the course of the PBCA rebid, did the rat pack

Gorris

discuss other strategies that could be used or potentially used to be able to bid on units above the unit cap if it were imposed?

A Yes.

Q What other strategies were discussed or potential strategies were discussed?

A One obviously is the lobbying effort to remove it.

The other one that I recall is that we would partner -- that we would have our partners do a higher percentage of the work so that those units didn't count against our unit cap.

Q At some point in time HUD announced that a subcontractor who performed less than 50 percent of the work would not have those units count against its unit cap; is that correct?

A Correct.

Q And the way HUD defined less than 50 percent of the work was that the subcontractor would have to employ fewer than 50 percent of the full-time equivalent employees

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

that did certain tasks on the projects, correct?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
form.

A Yes.

Q And essentially the tasks that  
the subcontractor would have to employ fewer  
than 50 percent of the FTEs for were the main  
day-to-day work under the PBCA contract,  
correct?

A Not -- no.

Q How is that incorrect?

A We looked at what work the  
subcontractor would be doing on an individual  
basis. We -- it wasn't necessarily all going to  
be the same work.

Q The idea that a subcontractor  
would not be held to the unit cap if they did  
less than 50 percent of the work was referred to  
at CGI as 49/51, correct?

A Yes.

Q And the working assumption, at  
least during some period of time by the rat  
pack, was that if CGI employed fewer than  
50 percent of the full-time equivalent

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

employees, then it would not have the units for that particular state counted against its unit cap, correct?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

A Yes.

Q Let me show you what we marked yesterday as Exhibit 14, which is produced as CGI 5043 and 7694 confidential (handing).

A (Perusing document.)

Q Mr. Gorris, can you take a moment to look at Exhibit 14, which is an e-mail dated May 17, 2010, together with the attachment?

MR. MAIR: This is the one that was missing a page. I have another copy.

So do you want to call the other copy 14A?

MR. KLEIN: I don't have a problem.

MR. MAIR: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

THE WITNESS: Can we take a short break?



Gorris

(Whereupon, at 11:46 a.m., a recess was taken.)

(Whereupon, Exhibit 14 was remarked to include all pages.)

(Whereupon, at 12:07 p.m., the deposition resumed without Ms. Holmes present.)

BY MR. MAIR:

Q Mr. Gorris, during the rebid process, is it fair to say that there was constant e-mailing of Excel spreadsheets and PowerPoint presentations to the rat pack members for purposes of discussing the rebid?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

A Yes.

Q And if we look at Exhibit 14, is this an example of one of those?

MR. KLEIN: I don't believe Mr. Gorris was a recipient.

Q You were not a recipient on this e-mail, I see, so if you look at the group of people that were recipients, can you

Gorris

characterize what group of people this is in terms of whether they are in the rat pack, whether they're a subset of the rat pack or whether they're above the rat pack?

A I would characterize them as being above the rat pack.

Q If you take a look at the PowerPoint that is attached to the e-mail dated May 17, 2010, and it's headed "HUD PBCA opportunity senior management committee progress update."

Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Have you ever seen this document before or a version of this document or a draft of this document?

A I haven't reviewed it, so ...

Q Take a moment to review it.

A (Perusing document.) I'm familiar with the information in here. I don't know if I've seen this exact one, but it's very familiar.

Q You have seen one that was similar, if not the same one?

1 Gorris

2 A The information in here I've  
3 seen, yes.

4 Q If we turn to Page 4, which for  
5 the record is the page that was missing in the  
6 exhibit when it was originally marked yesterday,  
7 but has not been added to Exhibit 14.

8 A (Perusing document.)

9 Q You are familiar with the  
10 information on Page 4, correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And this reflects the lobbying  
13 effort that CGI was undertaking to try to get  
14 HUD to decide against a unit cap; is that fair  
15 to say?

16 A To the best of my knowledge, yes.

17 Q And at this point in time, as of  
18 May 17, 2010, HUD had not made a final decision  
19 on whether or not to implement the unit cap,  
20 correct?

21 A I don't know how final their  
22 decision was in their mind.

23 Q Well, in terms of what was being  
24 discussed within the rat pack that you were  
25 involved with, am I correct that the discussion

1 Gorris

2 within the rat pack was HUD has not reached a  
3 final decision at this point to implement the  
4 unit cap?

5 A We were hopeful that we could  
6 change, however long the decision-making process  
7 were, we could affect that decision to be more  
8 favorable for us.

9 I don't know, I don't know how  
10 firm they were at HUD on the unit cap.

11 Q If you look on Page 4 in the  
12 second bullet point, it states, quote,  
13 "Optimistic that cap can be removed," close  
14 quote.

15 Do you see that?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Is it fair to say that around  
18 that point in time, the middle of May, there was  
19 a discussion amongst rat pack members that CGI  
20 was optimistic that the unit cap could be  
21 removed?

22 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
23 form.

24 A I don't recall.

25 Q Take a look at the next page,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

that's Page 5.

Do you see the first section that is headed "If unit cap"?

A Yes.

Q And that section describes in general the strategy that was being discussed within CGI that if the unit cap did remain in place for the rebid process, CGI would bid on one group of states and stay within the 300,000 unit cap, and then bid on a second group of states under what we earlier discussed as the 49/51 arrangement?

A Correct.

Q And if you look at the next bullet point that says, "options for 51 percent partner," there is a table next to that that lists the pros and cons of different prime partners, correct?

A Yes.

Q And under the pros for a PHA as CGI's partner, it states, quote, "Willing to transfer 51 percent to CGI after first year," close quote.

Do you see that?

1 Gorris

2 A (Perusing document.) Yes.

3 Q And that concept was discussed in  
4 rat pack conference calls, correct?

5 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
6 form.

7 A Yes.

8 Q The concept that was discussed at  
9 a certain point in time by the rat pack was the  
10 concept that for the states that were bid with  
11 CGI as the 49-percent subcontractor, the public  
12 housing authority may be willing to transfer  
13 back the other 51 percent of full-time  
14 equivalents after the rebid had been awarded,  
15 correct?

16 A Yes. Yes.

17 Q And CGI had an initial discussion  
18 with at least one PHA about that concept,  
19 correct?

20 A I don't know.

21 Q You spoke to the Denver Housing  
22 Authority, correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q You were the primary CGI contact  
25 with the Denver Housing Authority?

1 Gorris

2 A Yes.

3 Q And you met with executives of  
4 the Denver Housing Authority to discuss the  
5 49/51 scheme, correct?

6 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
7 form.

8 MR. MAIR: And if the  
9 objection is to the terminology,  
10 I apologize.

11 Q You met with the Denver Housing  
12 Authority executives to talk about the 49/51  
13 bidding concept, correct?

14 (Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m.,  
15 Ms. Holmes enters the room.)

16 A Yes.

17 Q And you met with the finance  
18 director; is that correct?

19 A I believe that was her position,  
20 yes.

21 Q And you also met with the  
22 executive director?

23 A He was involved in some of the  
24 conversations that we had over the course.

25 He wasn't involved in all the

1 Gorris

2 conversations.

3 Q And so let me expand my question  
4 to include in-person meetings and conversations  
5 that you had with the Denver Housing Authority.

6 You had discussions regarding the  
7 49/51 bidding concept, correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And at some point in those  
10 discussions you raised the possibility of a  
11 transfer back of 51 percent after the bidding  
12 was awarded, correct?

13 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
14 form.

15 A I don't recall that. I don't  
16 believe we did.

17 Q So sitting here today you don't  
18 remember discussing that with the Denver Housing  
19 Authority; is that your testimony?

20 A I don't recall that being part of  
21 the discussion.

22 Q But you're not able to say  
23 definitively that it was not, correct?

24 A I guess I can't.

25 I'm almost positive it wasn't,



1 Gorris

2 but I guess I don't recall.

3 Q And sitting here today, is it  
4 fair to say that of the public housing  
5 authorities -- well, strike that. Let me start  
6 with something else.

7 What other public housing  
8 authorities were you the primary contact with?

9 A The Oakland Housing Authority,  
10 Denver, as you mentioned, the Chicago Housing  
11 Authority and the Housing Authority of St. Louis  
12 County.

13 I believe that's all of them.

14 Q Now, in your discussions with any  
15 of those housing authorities, did you at any  
16 time raise as a concept or a possibility the  
17 idea that you could bid with them under the  
18 49/51 arrangement and that they could transfer  
19 back to you some of the 51 percent or all of the  
20 51 percent after the bids were awarded?

21 A It was never a major part of it,  
22 and I don't recall ever having that discussion.

23 Q When you say, "It was never a  
24 major part of it," am I correct that you don't  
25 recall definitively sitting here today whether

1 Gorris

2 at some point in the process that concept was  
3 floated with one or more of those housing  
4 authorities?

5 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
6 form.

7 A I don't believe it came up with  
8 any of those authorities.

9 Q Well, when you said earlier that  
10 it wasn't a major part of the discussion, what  
11 did you mean by that?

12 A I meant if it was ever mentioned  
13 that that never became a focus of it.

14 It was never about switching it  
15 back.

16 Q So that discussion, if it was  
17 raised with one of those housing authorities,  
18 didn't progress further than an initial  
19 discussion; is that fair to say?

20 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
21 form.

22 A It was never -- I don't remember  
23 it ever being part of our working plans with any  
24 of those housing authorities.

25 Q I want to distinguish between

Gorris

what your working plans were, what you decided to go with or didn't decide to go with.

My question is focused on whether the idea or the concept was ever raised, however preliminarily, at any point in time in your discussions with any of the four housing authorities that you were the primary contact with?

A I don't recall it ever being raised.

Q Now, other directors reporting to Ms. Carragher were the primary contacts with other housing authorities, correct?

A Correct.

Q In the discussions during the rat pack calls where the concept of potentially having a housing authority transfer back the 51 percent after the bid was awarded was discussed, was it ever discussed that any of those other directors would discuss that concept, however preliminarily, with any of the housing authorities that they were the contacts with?

A I don't recall.

1 Gorris

2 Q When during the course of the  
3 rebid process did the rat pack discuss the  
4 possibility of the 51 percent being transferred  
5 back by the Housing Authority after the rebid?

6 A I believe it was fairly early on,  
7 you know, when we were just looking at all the  
8 different possibilities out there.

9 Q Looking at what we marked as  
10 Exhibit 14, which is the PowerPoint spreadsheet,  
11 it's fair to say that that concept of  
12 transferring back the 51 percent after the rebid  
13 was still being discussed as of May 17, 2010,  
14 correct?

15 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
16 form.

17 A I can't answer, because I wasn't  
18 part of this meeting.

19 I'm not comfortable answering  
20 that.

21 Q Well, let me ask you something  
22 different.

23 The Exhibit 14 PowerPoint  
24 presentation is a presentation of a type that  
25 you had seen throughout your time in the rat

1 Gorris

2 pack, correct?

3 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
4 form.

5 A The material in here, I've seen  
6 most of the material before, yes.

7 Q And this, Exhibit 14, is a  
8 PowerPoint presentation that is giving a  
9 progress update to the senior management of CGI,  
10 correct?

11 If you look back at the first  
12 page of that presentation, Page 2 of the  
13 exhibit.

14 A That is what it is titled.

15 Q Do you have any reason to believe  
16 that the information that was given in that  
17 senior management committee progress update on  
18 May 17, 2010 was inaccurate?

19 A I have no way of knowing which  
20 parts of this are completely accurate or not.

21 Q Well, my question to you is,  
22 sitting here today, I understand that you  
23 haven't seen this document, this precise  
24 document before, but as somebody who was  
25 involved in the rat pack ongoing discussions

Gorris

throughout the rebid, do you have any reason to believe that on May 17, 2010, an inaccurate presentation would have been given to the CGI senior management committee about the status of that rebid?

A I have no reason to believe that the presentation would be inaccurate.

I have updated and reused previous PowerPoints before when doing presentations to the same group over and over again and forgotten to take pieces out. So that's why I can't comment.

Q Just to be clear, you don't have any specific reason to believe that that happened in that case?

A I have no reason to believe that.

Q Who is Patricia Duffy?

A She's an employee of CGI Federal.

Q She was involved in the rat pack discussions?

A Yes.

Q And she routinely circulated materials to the rat pack members for discussion during the calls, correct?

1 Gorris

2 A Yes.

3 Q Now, during the course of the rat  
4 pack discussions, did you ever see any  
5 spreadsheets that modeled out under a 49/51  
6 bidding arrangement what number of full-time  
7 equivalent employees would be employed by CGI  
8 and what number would be employed by the housing  
9 authority?

10 A At least for the states I was  
11 involved with, probably all, yes.

12 Q You did see that?

13 A Yes.

14 Q You saw that being modeled out  
15 under a 49/51 arrangement, or under some other  
16 arrangement or both?

17 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
18 form.

19 A I think both. There were a lot  
20 of spreadsheets going around during that time  
21 period.

22 I know I saw the modeling for the  
23 states I was involved with, and I believe it was  
24 probably included in other material.

25 My focus was more on the states I

1 Gorris

2 was involved with.

3 Q Well, were any of the states that  
4 you were involved with ultimately bid under a  
5 49/51 arrangement?

6 A I'm trying to get the different  
7 bids in my mind separated.

8 MR. KLEIN: You are  
9 talking about the first round?

10 A Right, right.

11 Q Yes, I'm talking about the first  
12 round.

13 A Yes, yes.

14 Q Has there been more than one  
15 round of bidding?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Just so we can try to pinpoint  
18 this in time, when approximately was the first  
19 round of bidding?

20 A It would have been, I believe the  
21 response for proposals was around April 2011.

22 Q That was the first round of  
23 bidding?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And of the states that you were



Gorris

responsible for, which ones in that April 2011 time frame bidding were bid under a 49/51 arrangement?

A Denver, Missouri and Wisconsin.

Q And who were the public housing authorities that you teamed up with in each of those?

A Denver was the Denver Housing Authority.

Missouri was the Housing Authority, St. Louis County, and Wisconsin was the Chicago Housing Authority.

Q For those three states, Denver, Missouri and Wisconsin, did you see specific modeling as to how the 49/51 staffing arrangement would work?

A Yes.

Q And who did that modeling?

A I believe Panos Kyprianou and Michael McManus.

Q You saw that modeling in a spreadsheet; is that correct?

A A variety of formats I'm sure, but, yes, a spreadsheet.

Gorris

Q You did see it in a spreadsheet format?

A Yes.

Q And were spreadsheets exchanged with the housing authorities involved in those bids that showed which FTEs would be employed by the Housing Authority and which would be employed by CGI?

A I don't recall the format, but I think the content, as far as the information that you described, which employees would be -- the modeling in which employees would belong to CGI and which employees would belong to the housing authority was provided.

Q When you say "provided," what do you mean?

A We sent them the information. It was either in e-mail, Word, PDF, I don't recall.

Q And what level of specificity was that information when it was provided to the housing authority?

A Could you -- I'm not --

Q Let me rephrase it.

Did you identify exactly which

Gorris

positions would be filled by employees of CGI versus the Housing Authority?

A We were pretty specific in the positions, the groupings of the positions, so, yes.

Q Are you familiar with the tasks 1 through 6 of the ACC?

A I'm familiar with them, just not the order.

Q For a subcontractor to exclude units from its unit cap, it had to employ fewer than 50 percent of the FTE positions for the tasks listed in Items 1 through 6 of the ACC, correct?

A I believe that's correct, yes.

Q Did you discuss with any of the three housing authorities involved in the Denver, Missouri or Wisconsin bids the concept that CGI would provide to them or transfer to them the employees that would fill the 51 percent of positions for Tasks 1 through 6 of the ACC?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

Gorris

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A No.

Q Was there any discussion as to how the housing authority was going to find the people to do 51 percent of that work?

A I don't recall detailed conversations.

There might have been brief discussions, but, no, no substantial discussions.

Q So in the case of the Denver Housing Authority, you initially approached the Denver Housing Authority with the concept of a 49/51 bid, correct?

A We brought the idea to them. They did not bring it to us.

Q And when you say "we," you were involved in that discussion?

A Yes.

Q And was Panos Kyprianou also involved in that discussion with them?

A He was involved in several of the discussions with Denver, not all of them, so I can't say about that one specifically.

Q Initially Denver was reluctant to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

go along with a 49/51 bid; is that fair to say?

A I don't recall.

Some partners were fine with it,  
others might have been more reluctant during our  
discussions.

I quite honestly can't separate  
which ones were more enthusiastic.

MR. MAIR: I'm going to  
mark as Exhibit 20, it's going to  
be an e-mail exchange between  
Mr. Gorris and Sarasu Zachariah,  
that's S-A-R-A-S-U, new word,  
Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A-H.

(An e-mail exchange between  
Mr. Gorris and Sarasu Zachariah,  
was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit  
20 for identification, as of this  
date.)

MR. MAIR: And then  
Exhibit 21 is going to be an  
e-mail exchange dated June 18,  
2010, where the top e-mail in the  
string is from Tracey Rudy to  
Mr. Gorris and others.

1                                   Gorris

2                                   (An e-mail exchange dated  
3                                   June 18, 2010, where the top e-mail  
4                                   in the string is from Tracey Rudy  
5                                   to Mr. Gorris, was marked as  
6                                   Plaintiff's Exhibit 21 for  
7                                   identification, as of this date.)

8       BY MR. MAIR:

9                   Q           Can you take a look at what we  
10                   have marked as Exhibits 20 and 21 (handing)?

11                  A           (Perusing document.)   Okay.

12                  Q           Exhibit 20 is an e-mail exchange  
13                   between you and Ms. Zachariah at the Denver  
14                   Housing Authority, correct?

15                  A           Yes.

16                  Q           Setting up a meeting for  
17                   June 17th of 2010?

18                  A           Correct.

19                  Q           And Exhibit 21 is, if we ignore  
20                   the first e-mail, the second e-mail is an e-mail  
21                   from you on June 18, 2010, essentially  
22                   summarizing your meeting with the Denver Housing  
23                   Authority on June 17th, correct?

24                  A           Yes.

25                  Q           And in that e-mail, in the last

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

or the second to last paragraph you refer to  
Ismael.

Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Ismael was the executive director  
of the Denver Housing Authority, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And you say "Ismael had to leave  
before we brought up the split work," and by  
"the split work," you're referring to bidding  
under a 49/51 scenario, correct?

A Yes.

Q In the next sentence you go on to  
state that "Sarasu said she would review with  
him, but we got the sense that there wasn't much  
of interest."

Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Does that refresh your  
recollection that in the initial conversation  
that you had with Denver about doing a 49/51  
bid, they didn't seem to be very interested?

A She was -- she had her concerns  
about it.

1 Gorris

2 I think he was more receptive  
3 when she shared it with him.

4 Q What were the concerns that were  
5 expressed by Ms. Zachariah?

6 A I don't recall. I don't recall.

7 Q Is it fair to say that the Denver  
8 Housing Authority at that point in time did not  
9 have employees who were trained and ready to  
10 step in to perform Tasks 1 through 6 of the ACC?

11 A I can't say for all the tasks.

12 There was probably, definitely  
13 some skill gaps in some of the tasks.

14 Q The Denver Housing Authority was  
15 at that time an existing partner with CGI on  
16 PBCA work, correct?

17 A No.

18 Q They hadn't partnered with Denver  
19 prior to that?

20 A CGI had no relation, no PBCA  
21 relationship with Denver prior to the rebid.

22 Q Was Denver doing other PBCA work  
23 without CGI at that time?

24 A They were doing work that was  
25 similar, I believe.



1 Gorris

2 I believe they had what is known  
3 as TCA contracts and other housing authority  
4 work, but they were not doing PBCA work.

5 Q You weren't administering Section  
6 8 PBCA contracts, correct?

7 A I don't know. They may have  
8 been.

9 I'm sorry, no.

10 Q They were not?

11 A Not Section 8 PBCA contracts.

12 Q Was there ever a discussion at  
13 any point in time that you had with anybody at  
14 the Denver Housing Authority about who would  
15 actually staff the 51 percent of the positions  
16 that would be necessary for them to do the work  
17 under a 49/51 bidding scenario?

18 A I mean, the discussion would be  
19 that Denver would be staffing those people.

20 Q Well, was there ever a discussion  
21 as to whether Denver had people on its payroll  
22 who in addition to whatever else they were doing  
23 could step in and perform the 51 percent of that  
24 work?

25 A No. They would hire people.

Gorris

Q CGI had people who performed  
Items 1 through 6 of the ACC tasks in its  
current PBCA work, correct?

A Yes.

Q Was there ever a discussion that  
you had with Denver about Denver hiring or using  
any of those CGI folks to perform the 51 percent  
of the work?

A Never.

Q You said that Ms. Zachariah was  
initially not very interested in the idea of  
49/51 bidding, correct?

A Yes.

Q And was part of her reluctance  
the fact that they didn't have the staff to do  
the 51 percent?

A I think it was -- I just don't  
think they wanted to be bothered with all of it.  
They just wanted the income.

Q In fact, the partnership between  
CGI and the public housing authority was  
extremely lucrative for the public housing  
authority in the PBCA work, correct?

A Under the initial contracts.

1 Gorris

2 Q Before the rebid?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Under those contracts, the public  
5 housing authorities did very little work for the  
6 money that they received, correct?

7 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
8 form.

9 A It depended on the contract and  
10 the partner.

11 Q Has CGI as of today done any work  
12 with the Denver Housing Authority on any PBCA  
13 contracts?

14 A Not on any PBCA contracts.

15 Q CGI has worked for the Denver  
16 Housing Authority on other projects, correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q What other projects?

19 A I was not specifically involved,  
20 but it was a housing-related project.

21 Q Now, can you summarize for me the  
22 extent of what discussions you personally had  
23 with anyone in the Denver Housing Authority  
24 about how they would staff the 51 percent FTE  
25 positions in the event that that bid for PBCA

1 Gorris

2 work was successful?

3 A We, at that point in time, we did  
4 not have, we never had deep discussions about  
5 how they would staff it.

6 Q When you say you didn't have deep  
7 discussions, can you summarize the extent of the  
8 discussions, if any, that you did have?

9 A They would be staffing it up, we  
10 would provide support for the 51 percent, and to  
11 the extent that we could, if they needed help in  
12 recruiting, we may do that, we definitely would  
13 provide training, we would provide oversight, we  
14 would make sure that their management staff  
15 would, we would do our best to make sure they  
16 were not deeply impacted, that we would take on  
17 a lot of responsibilities to make sure that the  
18 contract was compliant and running smoothly.

19 Q You said that you provided  
20 information to the Denver Housing Authority  
21 about which positions they would have to fill  
22 under a 49/51 split; is that correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And that was by e-mail you  
25 provided this?

1 Gorris

2 A I believe so, yes.

3 Q Was the e-mail sent by you  
4 personally?

5 A I believe so.

6 Q Was there anybody else during  
7 that rebid process leading up to the first of  
8 the rebid submittals, was there anybody else at  
9 CGI who interacted with Denver on the details of  
10 the PBCA rebid?

11 A I believe -- I was the main point  
12 of contact, so I believe any discussion came  
13 from me, but Panos Kyprianou, Mike McManus may  
14 have been involved in additional conversations.

15 They were sometimes involved in  
16 discussions.

17 Q If the details of the 49/51  
18 staffing split were not e-mailed by you, is  
19 there anyone other than Mr. McManus or Mr.  
20 Kyprianou who could have e-mailed that  
21 information to Denver?

22 A I don't recall anyone else being  
23 involved with at that point in time any  
24 discussions with Denver.

25 Q Who in terms of people at Denver

1 Gorris

2 did you speak with and e-mail with?

3 A It was -- my main point of  
4 contact was Sarasu Zachariah.

5 There may have been others  
6 included on e-mail strings, Ismael Guerrou, the  
7 director, was often included in e-mails, and I  
8 recall there being maybe one or two others. I  
9 don't recall names at this point in time.

10 Q Is it fair to say that whenever  
11 the staffing breakdown was e-mailed to Denver,  
12 it was either e-mailed to or copied to Sarasu  
13 Zachariah?

14 A Yes. Yes. She would have been  
15 on an e-mail.

16 Q Now, in terms of the St. Louis  
17 County Housing Authority that you partnered with  
18 in Missouri?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Did you have any discussions as  
21 to how the 51 percent would be staffed by St.  
22 Louis?

23 A Nothing in detail, just, again,  
24 they would be responsible for staffing their  
25 51 percent and we would provide if we were

Gorris

successful in winning the award, we would provide support in the training, making sure that it was compliant and if they needed additional support we would find ways to support them, whether it was through helping them locate staff or whatever they asked us to do, we told them we would be available.

Q Did you send models to the St. Louis County Housing Authority about how the, specifically how the 49/51 staffing would work?

A I believe we sent models just to what numbers and what their roles would be under both CGI and St. Louis County.

Q And that was sent by e-mail?

A Yes.

Q Who sent it on the CGI side?

A It would have been myself.

Q Who was it sent to at St. Louis?

A A gentleman by the name of Chad Graham was my main point of contact at that time.

Q Chad Graham?

A Yes.

Q G-R-A-H-A-M?

1 Gorris

2 A I believe.

3 Q Now, what about the Chicago  
4 Housing Authority, who was your main point of  
5 contact there?

6 A A gentleman by the name of Eli  
7 Rosario.

8 Q Was there anybody else that you  
9 regularly dealt with at Chicago?

10 A There was another gentleman who  
11 was often copied on e-mails, but he would have,  
12 Eli would have been on everything and I do not  
13 recall the other gentleman's name.

14 Q Did you provide detailed modeling  
15 of how the 49/51 staffing would work with  
16 Chicago Housing Authority?

17 A Only for the State of Wisconsin,  
18 we provided, I believe similar to the other ones  
19 mentioned, what staff would report to CGI, who  
20 would report through Chicago Housing Authority  
21 and what their roles would be.

22 Q You did that with respect to  
23 Wisconsin, because Wisconsin was the state that  
24 you were bidding under 49/51, correct?

25 A Yes.



1 Gorris

2 Q You also partnered with Chicago  
3 Housing Authority to bid on other states under  
4 the CGI unit cap; is that correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q What states?

7 A Illinois.

8 Q Just to be clear, in the  
9 June 17th meeting with the Denver Housing  
10 Authority, Mr. Kyprianou was with you in that  
11 meeting, correct?

12 A (Perusing document.) Yes.

13 Q Can you take a look at what was  
14 marked yesterday as Exhibit 16.

15 MR. MAIR: For the record,  
16 it's a cover e-mail from Michael  
17 McManus dated June 25, 2010, with  
18 a spreadsheet attached that is,  
19 has a production number CGI 5033  
20 confidential.

21 (Whereupon at 12:54, Ms.  
22 Carragher left the room.)

23 A (Perusing document.) Okay.

24 Q Now, I see that you are not  
25 copied on the e-mail.

1 Gorris

2 But if you turn to the  
3 spreadsheet, have you seen spreadsheets like  
4 this as part of the rebid process?

5 A (Perusing document.) I believe  
6 only for the states that I was involved with.

7 Q If you turn to the second page of  
8 the spreadsheet, you see at the top of the  
9 spreadsheet, first of all, it appears to include  
10 all of the states that CGI was considering  
11 bidding on, correct, or approximately all of  
12 them?

13 A Approximately all of them, yes.

14 Q The top portion of the  
15 spreadsheet models out a scenario whereby CGI is  
16 providing 90 percent or more of the FTE staffing  
17 positions for each of the states.

18 Do you see that?

19 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
20 form.

21 (Whereupon, at 12:56 p.m.,  
22 Ms. Carragher enters the room.)

23 Q Let me revise that.

24 A It's a lot of information.  
25 Go ahead.

1 Gorris

2 Q If you look at the states that  
3 you're involved in.

4 A Okay.

5 Q CGI under this modeling is  
6 providing the majority of the staffing in each  
7 of those states, correct?

8 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
9 form.

10 A Yes.

11 Q Now, did you ever see similar  
12 modeling to this where CGI was provided only  
13 49 percent or less of staffing for the states of  
14 Denver, Missouri and Wisconsin?

15 A I believe I saw some modeling and  
16 I don't recall how exactly it matched up with  
17 this.

18 Q You saw some 49/51 modeling for  
19 each of those states?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And in terms of the revenues, did  
22 you see revenues for those three states modeled  
23 under a 49/51 scenario?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Just in general terms, how did

Gorris

the revenue split between CGI and the public housing authority differ in the 49/51 modeling that you saw?

A I honestly don't recall how the revenue differed.

I would have to see it.

Q In your discussions with Denver, St. Louis or Chicago, did you discuss how the profit split would differ, if at all, under the 49/51 bidding?

A We definitely discussed profit under all models.

Q So let's take the Denver Housing Authority.

The original bidding scenario was going to be with CGI doing 100 percent of the work for Tasks 1 through 6, correct?

MR. KLEIN: Object to the form.

A I would say above 90 to 95 percent of the work.

Q When you had those discussions, what was discussed as to the profit split between CGI and Denver?

1 Gorris

2 A I don't recall what the split  
3 was.

4 Q When you discussed with Denver  
5 the 49/51 bidding scenario, did you discuss  
6 there being a different profit split at that  
7 point in time?

8 A I believe that all of the numbers  
9 had to change because they were, because of  
10 their role in employing more people.

11 So the, I believe that there was  
12 changes in all the numbers.

13 Q In those number changes, was  
14 Denver going to receive a larger profit out of  
15 the work than it was when you discussed CGI  
16 doing 90 percent or more of the work?

17 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
18 form.

19 A My recollection is that they  
20 would receive a larger, that the revenue would  
21 be larger, their profit percentage wouldn't  
22 necessarily, would definitely be smaller though.

23 My recollection is that their  
24 profit percentage would definitely be smaller.

25 Q Was the discussion that they

Gorris

would receive approximately the same dollar amount in profits under the 49/51 scenario as they were going to receive under a scenario with CGI doing 90 percent or more of the work?

A I don't remember the numbers.

I think -- I would have to review what the profit numbers were.

Q I'm just trying to understand what you said.

When you said the revenues would go up, but their profit percentage would go down, you --

A Their expenses were going up greatly.

Q And so am I correct that the discussion in general was that they were going to receive the same dollar amount of profit as they would have under a scenario of CGI doing 90 percent or more of the work?

A The dollar amounts, I believe, changed.

I don't recall, I believe all the numbers changed, so the dollar amounts would have had to have changed.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

I don't recall if it went up or  
down.

Q Were documents exchanged with  
each of the three housing authorities that  
modeled out how the revenues and profits would  
be split under a 49/51 scenario?

A Yes.

Q Was that exchanged between the  
same group of people on the CGI side that we  
talked about, that's you, Mr. McManus and/or Mr.  
Kyprianou, and the same people on the Housing  
Authority side that you have previously  
identified?

A Yes.

Q Were you involved in negotiating  
any of the memorandums of understanding with the  
three public housing authorities that you were  
involved with?

A Yes.

Q Were you the primary person  
negotiating the MOUs?

A I was the primary point of  
contact for CGI.

Q In those discussions?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

A Yes.

Q Originally when CGI was going to do 90 percent or more of the work, you executed MOUs with each of the three housing authorities, Denver, St. Louis and Chicago, correct?

A Denver and St. Louis, yes.

I can't recall if Chicago, if we ever completed the MOU prior to the change.

Q The change in 49/51?

A Yes.

Q So the original MOUs with the Denver Housing Authority and with St. Louis County Housing Authority, were MOUs in which CGI was undertaking to do 90 percent or more of the work, correct?

A I do not recall how specific it is stated in it, but CGI was, the understanding was CGI was doing the bulk of the work.

Q Did CGI ever enter into new memorandums of understanding with Denver or St. Louis after the bidding for Missouri and Denver went over to 49/51 bidding?

A I believe, yes.

Q For both of those two states?



1 Gorris

2 A Yes.

3 Q So you recall definitively that  
4 new MOUs were entered into for Denver and  
5 Missouri for a 49/51 scenario?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And is it your testimony that you  
8 don't remember whether Chicago, there ever was a  
9 memorandum of understanding before the 49/51  
10 bidding scenario?

11 A Yeah, I just -- one of the MOUs  
12 we did took a while to get executed, and just  
13 with the flurry of activity, I cannot recall.

14 Q And you were the point person  
15 negotiating the new MOUs with Denver and St.  
16 Louis?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Do you recall approximately when  
19 the new MOUs were entered into?

20 A I believe they were entered into  
21 after HUD released the invitation.

22 Q But before the bids were  
23 submitted by CGI?

24 A Yes.

25 MR. MAIR: Let's take a

1 Gorris

2 break.

3 Off the record.

4 (Discussion off the record.)

5 (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a  
6 recess was taken.)

7 (Whereupon, at 1:20 p.m.,  
8 the deposition resumed without Ms.  
9 Holmes present.)

10 BY MR. MAIR:

11 Q Mr. Gorris, do you recall during  
12 the PBCA rebid process having an off-site  
13 meeting down in Fairfax, Virginia?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And during that day, do you  
16 recall having a conference call with the Denver  
17 Housing Authority from somebody's hotel room?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And that was at the Hyatt Hotel;  
20 is that correct?

21 A I believe so, yes.

22 Q And after the call with Denver,  
23 did a number of members of the rat pack gather  
24 in the hotel bar to talk?

25 (Whereupon, at 1:21 p.m.,

1 Gorris

2 Ms. Holmes enters the room.)

3 A I believe we went to dinner at  
4 some point and afterwards had drinks.

5 Q Mr. Ashmore was there, correct?

6 A I honestly don't recall.

7 Q At some point that afternoon or  
8 evening in either the hotel bar or the  
9 restaurant, Les Pierce floated an idea along the  
10 lines of, "What about we set up independent  
11 companies which directors could head that could  
12 submit bids on the rebid process as a way around  
13 the 400,000 or other unit cap," correct?

14 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
15 form.

16 A I don't remember or I wasn't part  
17 of the conversation.

18 Q But when you say you don't  
19 remember, you're saying that you don't remember  
20 that being said?

21 A I have no recollection of that  
22 being said.

23 Q Mr. Pierce has an ownership  
24 interest in one or more franchised fast food  
25 outlets, correct?

1 Gorris

2 A He does. I don't know if he  
3 considers it fast food, but ...

4 Q Does he have a Honey Baked Ham  
5 franchise?

6 A It's my understanding that he  
7 does.

8 Q And either in this hotel in  
9 Fairfax or at some point during the rebid  
10 process, Mr. Pierce suggested, whether seriously  
11 or not, that some similar outside company,  
12 similar to the idea of his franchises, could be  
13 used in order to get around the unit cap,  
14 correct?

15 MR. KLEIN: Object to the  
16 form.

17 A I don't recall that, him saying  
18 that.

19 Q Is it your testimony that you  
20 don't recall him ever mentioning any concept  
21 where he referred to his food franchise and  
22 linked it in some way to an idea of how CGI  
23 could get around the unit cap?

24 A I don't remember him ever  
25 mentioning that.

1 Gorris

2 Q Have you ever heard the term  
3 "Honey Baked Ham" and PBCA?

4 A I have heard Honey Baked Ham.  
5 I don't recall Honey Baked Ham  
6 PBCA.

7 Q And just so I'm clear, it's your  
8 testimony sitting here today that you don't  
9 recall anyone ever mentioning Honey Baked Ham in  
10 the context of the PBCA rebid process; is that  
11 correct?

12 A I don't recall that, yes.

13 Q Can you take a look at what was  
14 marked yesterday as Exhibit 15 (handing)?

15 A (Perusing document.)

16 Q This is a document produced as  
17 CGI 5603 confidential, dated July 12, 2010.

18 If you need to take a minute to  
19 review this, then by all means do so, but can  
20 you tell me after that, have you seen this  
21 document before?

22 A (Perusing document.)

23 MR. MAIR: Off the record.

24 (Discussion off the record.)

25 Q I'll reask the question.

Gorris

Have you ever seen Exhibit 15 before?

A I believe so, yes.

Q Can you tell me what it is?

A It is a document internal to CGI that would be used as part of the many review processes that we go through to get larger deals approved.

Q Now, if you look at Page 3 of the document, do you see under the third bullet point and the second subbullet point of that, do you see that it states, quote, "Unit cap increase from 300 K to 400 K for PHAs and subcontractors"?

A Yes.

Q And during the process leading up to the final request for proposals, HUD increased the proposed unit cap from 300,000 to 400,000, right?

A Yes.

Q And it was CGI's understanding as reflected in the next bullet point that that limit, that unit count was going to be a limit on proposal submissions only, right?

1 Gorris

2 A I don't recall, but it seems  
3 reasonable. I mean, I really don't recall that  
4 specifically, but it's in here.

5 Q Do you recall specifically the  
6 discussion within the rat pack at some point in  
7 time that the unit cap would only be applicable  
8 for the bidding and not after the contracts were  
9 awarded?

10 A I recall that at certain periods  
11 of time that was our understanding. It changed  
12 a lot.

13 Q Did CGI ever ask HUD to clarify  
14 that?

15 A I believe so.

16 Q When you say you believe so, do  
17 you have any specific knowledge of that?

18 A I can't recall specifically if --  
19 I wasn't involved. I don't believe I was  
20 involved if that question was asked.

21 Q Can you turn to Page 22, and  
22 there is no number on it, but it appears after  
23 Page 21 that does have a page number?

24 A (Perusing document.) Okay.

25 Q Can you tell me what this page

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

represents?

A (Perusing document.) It appears to be the page that describes our information about what we intend to bid on with our Ohio PHA client, the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority.

Q Were you involved in Ohio?

A No.

Q At that stage?

A No.

Q Take a look down to the, I believe it's the eighth line that says "CGI role."

Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q And it describes CGI's role as being "prime for PHA partnership," and then in parenthesis "(sub during HUD recompet)," close parenthesis.

Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q What does that mean?

A I'm not, I'm not 100 percent sure.



1 Gorris

2 I don't know.

3 Q Does that refer to the concept  
4 that had been discussed at one point by the rat  
5 pack of having CGI be a 49-percent subcontractor  
6 during the bidding process and having the other  
7 51 percent transferred back by the housing  
8 authority after the award of the contract?

9 A Yes. Yes.

10 MR. MAIR: I'm going to  
11 mark as Exhibit 22, a document  
12 that was produced as CGI 4447  
13 confidential. It's a spreadsheet  
14 that contains four pages,  
15 although the last page appears to  
16 be blank.

17 (A document produced by CGI,  
18 Bates stamped CGI 4447  
19 Confidential, was marked as  
20 Plaintiff's Exhibit 22 for  
21 identification, as of this date.)

22 BY MR. MAIR:

23 Q Mr. Gorris, can you look at  
24 Exhibit 22 (handing), and if you want to take a  
25 moment to review it, but my first question is

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Gorris

going to be have you seen it before?

A (Perusing document.) I believe  
so, yes.

Q And what is it?

A It just identifies the states  
that we were going to be pursuing, the account  
leads, some support, the partners, the estimated  
revenue.

Q Is this one of the documents that  
was circulated amongst the rat pack members  
during the PBCA rebid?

A It was circulated at some point  
in time, yes.

Q Circulated amongst the rat pack  
members?

A Yes.

(Whereupon, at 1:34 p.m.,  
Ms. Holmes leaves the room.)

Q And just so I understand your  
answer, it shows, broken down by the directors  
who were responsible for them, a breakdown of  
the states that CGI was going to bid on,  
correct?

A At that time, yes.

1 Gorris

2 Q The allocation of states between  
3 directors changed somewhat during the course of  
4 the rebid; is that fair to say?

5 A And the states that we were  
6 looking at was often fluid.

7 Q So there was some change in this  
8 along the way?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Based upon the allocations of the  
11 states amongst directors, are you able to put a  
12 time frame of when this would have been  
13 circulated?

14 MR. MAIR: And I'll just  
15 note for the record that the date  
16 at the bottom of the document is  
17 the date the document was  
18 printed, not the date it was  
19 created or circulated.

20 It's a 2013 date at the  
21 bottom.

22 A I don't believe I can tell just  
23 based on this document.

24 Q Okay.

25 MR. MAIR: I have no

Gorris

further questions.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you,  
Tony.

(Whereupon, at 1:37 p.m.,  
the deposition was concluded.)

---

TONY GORRIS

Subscribed and sworn to  
before me  
this [REDACTED] day of [REDACTED], 2013.

---

NOTARY PUBLIC

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## I N D E X P A G E

Witness	Examination By	Page
Tony Gorris	Mr. Mair	4

## EXHIBITS

Plaintiff's Exhibits	Description	Page
19	An e-mail from William Durivage dated June 9, 2010, together with an attachment that is headed "CAOM/PBCA Conference Call June 9, 2010"	55
20	An e-mail exchange between Mr. Gorris and Sarasu Zachariah	84
21	An e-mail exchange dated June 18, 2010, where the top e-mail in the string is from Tracey Rudy to Mr. Gorris	85
22	A document produced by CGI, Bates stamped CGI 4447 Confidential	112

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF NEW YORK )

) ss.

COUNTY OF NEW YORK )

I, MARGARET M. HARRIS, a Shorthand  
(Stenotype) Reporter and Notary Public of  
the State of New York, do hereby certify  
that the foregoing Deposition, of the  
witness, TONY GORRIS, taken at the time  
and place aforesaid, is a true and correct  
transcription of my shorthand notes.

I further certify that I am neither  
counsel for nor related to any party to  
said action, nor in any wise interested in  
the result or outcome thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 21st day of June, 2013.

---

MARGARET M. HARRIS